

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of May 23, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 6, and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-23 remain pending in this application after entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 16, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers ("Using Graphic History in Browsing the World Wide Web," Proc. 4th Intl. WWW Conference, Boston, December 1995) in view of Bukszar *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,916, hereinafter "Bukszar") and in further view of Weiss *et al.* (U.S. Provisional Patent Appln. No. 60/184,331, hereinafter "Weiss"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "displaying the thumbnail snapshot of the accessed web page to the user in an area of a screen if the accessed web page content and the previously accessed web page content are not the same, wherein the thumbnail snapshot provides one or more options that, when selected by a user, store the thumbnail snapshot as a bookmark." Neither Ayers, Bukszar nor Weiss, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such a feature. At most, Bukszar discloses caching and saving graphical representations of a file (such as an HTML page) in a graphical user interface. Abstract. Even so, Bukszar fails to teach or suggest that the graphical representations provide options to store the graphical representations as bookmarks. Ayers and Weiss do not cure this deficiency. As such, claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason.

Independent claims 6 and 16, as amended, recite comparing the accessed web page content to a previously accessed web page content and displaying the thumbnail snapshot of the accessed web page only if the accessed web page content and the previously accessed web page content are not the same. The Office Action concedes that neither Ayers nor Bukszar teaches the above-recited features of claims 6 and 16. Instead, the Office Action relies on Weiss to cure the deficiencies of Ayers and Bukszar. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the teachings of Weiss would lead one to conclude that "thumbnails are only generated for results that are [not] identical or at least unique to compliment other content returned to the user as the result of a query to a search engine." p. 4 (citing Ayers, pp. 3-5). Applicants respectfully disagree. There

is no teaching or suggestion in Weiss to display thumbnails *only if the accessed web page content and the previously accessed web page content are not the same*, as is recited in claims 6 and 16. In fact, Weiss specifically teaches that once a result list is created, a user can view the results “instantly or almost instantly.” p. 8, ¶¶ 6-7. Weiss further teaches that pre-processing such as result filtering and removal of duplicate results occurs *after* the result list has already been displayed to the user. p. 9, ¶ 4. In one example, Weiss discloses that the web pages in the result list may be presented and/or displayed to a user as graphical result previews. p. 9, ¶ 10. From the foregoing, Weiss clearly does not teach or suggest displaying thumbnails *only if the accessed web page content and the previously accessed web page content are not the same*. In fact, Weiss indicates that graphical result previews may be displayed to a user before duplicate results removal (i.e., “pre-processing”) is performed. Claims 6 and 16 are thus allowable for at least this reason.

In addition, there is no motivation to combine Ayers and Bukszar with Weiss in the manner suggested by the Office Action. In asserting the combination, the Office Action contends that “adding the teaching of Weiss [to Ayers and Bukszar] prevents the user from accumulating /storing multiple copies of thumbnails and associated information that is identical.” p. 5. However, Ayers clearly states that “the browser makes no attempt to determine if two different URLs reference the same document, so sometimes the same document can appear more than once in the Graphic History View.” Clearly, Ayers teaches away from the duplicate results removal methods and systems of Weiss. At the very least, the above statement represents a specific lack of motivation and/or disinterest on the part of Ayers to implement any form of duplicate results removal and/or comparison of an accessed web page to a previously access web page. As such, one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to combine Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss in the manner suggested by the Office Action. In addition, Bukszar would not cure the deficiencies that would remain if either Ayers or Weiss were removed from the alleged combination. Claims 6 and 16 are thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 21, and 22 depend from claims 1, 6, or 16, and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 6, or 16 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 2, 7, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss, and in further view of Hightower *et al.* (“Graphical Multiscale Web histories,” ACM Hypertext ’98 Conference, June 20-24, 1998, hereinafter “Hightower”). Claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers, Bukszar, Weiss and Hightower and in further view of Collins-Rector *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,398, hereinafter “Collins-Rector”). Claims 5, 10, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss, and in further view of Kandogan *et al.* (“Elastic Windows: A Hierarchical Multi-Window World-Wide Web Browser,” 1997, ACM, pp. 169-177, hereinafter “Kandogan”). Claims 13, 15, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers, Bukszar, Weiss and Kandogan and in further view of Robertson *et al.* (“Data Mountain: Using Spatial Memory for document Management,” 1998, ACM, pp. 153-162, hereinafter “Robertson”). Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss, and in further view of Collins-Rector. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 17-20 and 23 depend from claim 1, 6, or 16, respectively. As set forth above, the combination of Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 6 and 16. Hightower, Collins-Rector, Kandogan, Robertson, or any combination thereof, fails to cure the deficiencies of Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss. Nor does the Office Action assert that any combination of Hightower, Collins-Rector, Kandogan, or Robertson does cure the deficiencies of Ayers, Bukszar and Weiss as discussed above. Claims 2-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 17-20 and 23 are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 6 and 16, respectively, and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

For example, claims 5, 10 and 20 recite, *inter alia*, displaying one or more thumbnail snapshots of bookmarked web pages in a second area of the screen. Nowhere does any of the cited references teach or suggest such a feature, either separately or in combination. The Office Action concedes that neither Ayers, Bukszar nor Weiss teach or suggest such a feature. However, the Office Action alleges that Kandogan cures the deficiency. Contrary to this allegation, Kandogan merely discloses a multi-window browser capable of opening and viewing multiple pages at a time. In other words, Fig. 1 of Kandogan illustrates multiple windows and/or web pages open in the Elastic Windows browser, not thumbnails. p. 170, ¶¶ 3-6. The Office

Action likens a web page “reduced in size” to a thumbnail. However, such a comparison is invalid. Thumbnails, as described in Applicants’ specification, relate to compressed snapshots of web pages. A reduced size web page does not constitute a *compressed snapshot* of the web page. As such, claims 5, 10 and 20 are allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 23, 2006

By: _____

Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001